

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

PIN: 6984
APPLICANT NAME: Calleguas Municipal Water District
PROJECT TITLE: Calleguas Creek Watershed

FUNDS REQUESTED: \$ 49,458,750
COST MATCH: \$110,296,200
TOTAL PROJECT COST: \$159,754,950

DESCRIPTION: Management Program (Brineline), Renewable Water Resource Management Program for the Southern Reaches of Calleguas Creek Watershed, Camarillo Groundwater Treatment Facility, Las Posas Basin Regional Desalter, Somis Desalter, West Simi Desalter, Simi Valley Regional Recycled Water System, Conejo Creek North Fork - Wildwood Park Water Management Enhancement Project, and Arundo/Tamarisk Removal.

Question: Consistency with Minimum IRWM Standards - This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards.

Pass

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption. Weighting factor is 1. 5

Applicant submitted the Calleguas Creek Watershed Management Plan (CCWMP) with addendums. The plan was approved by its governing body on June 15, 2005. Attachment #3 says that Volume I: Phase I Report for the CCWMP and Volume II: Addendum, together comprise the IRWMP. The applicant states that the two volumes together, are intended to be a functional-equivalent IRWMP.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Description of Region. Weighting factor is 1. 4

Applicant provides a comprehensive description of the region and provides detailed maps identifying the Calleguas Creek Watershed as the region. There is also a thorough discussion of quality and quantity of water and social and cultural makeup of the regional community, important cultural and social values, and economic conditions and trends. There is limited discussion of current and future water demand. The proposal did not adequately discuss ecological processes and environmental resources of the region. Project involves taking effluent at the source in an effluent dominated stream and does not discuss remaining flow or how current beneficial uses of the stream will be maintained. Does not discuss how it will affect beneficial uses of Point Magu and the ASBS or impacts of discharge at Ormond Beach.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Objectives. Weighting factor is 1. 4

Applicant thoroughly identifies regional planning objectives, manner in which they were determined and addressed major water related objectives and conflicts in the region. Objectives are: 1) reducing dependence on imported water, 2) improving water supply reliability, 3) managing and removing salts in the watershed and complying with TMDL requirements. Applicant doesn't describe recommendations of the two regionally adopted TMDLs. Applicant doesn't discuss basin plan objectives and support of beneficial uses or provide a comprehensive discussion of possible pollution control efforts. See other comments about integration with Ventura for an integrated watershed approach.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Water Management Strategies and Integration. Weighting factor is 1. 3

Many of the water management strategies identified in the Guidelines are considered in the CCWMP and are components of the IRWMP proposed projects. The proposal includes a thorough analysis of projects which links applicable strategies and individual projects with others for full integration and efficiency. Significant water quality and environmental enhancement strategies are not adequately addressed. The proposal doesn't discuss either the RWB or USEPA TMDL. Consideration of opportunities or strategies for integrating ecosystem restoration, habitat or ground water management, wetlands enhancement throughout the region is needed. The proposal also does not clearly identify and discuss strategies for mitigation of the approximately 20 miles of lost habitat that may be expected from implementation of this proposal.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Priorities and Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The proposal includes sufficient detail on priorities and schedule but did not adequately explain how they were derived or how they would be modified during the process. Provisions are made for stakeholders to assess regional issues and redefine priorities. Further discussion of how priorities fit in with regional issues is needed.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Implementation. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The proposal includes a thorough description of each project and its specific actions, its relationship to management strategies, as well as timelines and schedules, and integration with other projects. Each cooperating entity is identified regarding each project, and approximate capital costs are included. A current status is provided for each project. The institutional structure of the project's implementation is provided within the text of the project descriptions. Technical studies supporting the projects are referenced however; a more comprehensive analysis of technical merit is needed.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Impacts and Regional Benefits. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The proposal discusses advantages of the regional plan but does not evaluate potential negative impacts within the region. It also includes discussion of advantages to disadvantaged communities; however, there are no specifically identifiable disadvantaged communities in the region. Identification and further discussion is needed on interregional benefits and impacts, and impacts and benefits to other resources such as groundwater, the ASBS, or Ormond Beach.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Technical Analysis and Plan Performance. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The IRWMP discusses numerous technical plans and studies that have been conducted within the Region to help prioritize projects in the IRWMP. Success would primarily be evaluated through: 1) a water quality monitoring plan 2) quantification of the local water resources put to beneficial use 3) measurement of the quantity of water made available and 4) documentation of community outreach activities. Further discussion is needed on potential data gaps and measures that will be used to evaluate projects and IRWMP performance.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Data Management. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The IRWMP has established a website where the public can obtain copies of the various technical reports, meeting information, and GIS data. Action No. 2 of the IRWMP included the development of a data repository to collect and disseminate all applicable information, and to ensure that data is organized and presented in appropriate formats, such as those consistent with SWAMP and GAMA. The IRWMP to date has collected an extensive amount of data, and monitoring activities continue to generate water quality and supply data. A more thorough assessment of the applicability of these monitoring efforts for regional purposes is needed. A discussion of how data will support statewide needs should have been provided.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Financing. Weighting factor is 1.

5

The Proposal identifies beneficiaries and provides comprehensive discussion of financing options for proposal implementation. Applicant shows that the necessary match funds are committed. The proposal indicates the lead agency would provide the local funding match from other federal and local grants and low-interest loans to the extent possible, with the remainder coming from CIP funds. Some revenue will also be generated through the sale of water. Some funding has already been obtained for the Brineline project through SWB and USBR programs. The applicant should provide further detail on the source of SWB funding already committed so potential conflicts with Bond Law can be evaluated.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Relation to Local Planning & Sustainability. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The proposal provides a thorough discussion of how local agency planning documents relate to the strategies and the dynamics between the two levels of planning documents. It also demonstrates appropriate coordination with local land use planning decision makers. There is limited discussion of how the identified actions and projects relate to planning documents established by local agencies.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination. Weighting factor is 1.

3

A comprehensive list of local, State, and Federal, water suppliers, recreational groups, business organizations, and regulatory agencies, and other stakeholders is provided. It does not appear to include members of the community that are concerned about loss of habitat. The proposal indicates public meetings are open to the public but did not document public outreach activities or discuss how stakeholders would be identified in the future. Decision making power of stakeholders seems to rest entirely on their participation in subcommittees. More discussion of environmental justice concerns and how DACs could be involved in the IRWMP coordination process is needed. The proposal does not identify any obstacles but the lack of involvement of Ventura County as a stakeholder may suggest there could be pending unidentified conflicts.

Question: Funding Match. This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated the ability to meet the minimum funding match or has requested a waiver or reduction in the funding match.

Pass

Question: Description of Proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

12

The proposal provides a thorough description of the 9 projects identified in the IRWMP. Project descriptions are presented 13 different ways, describing how the project meets goals and objectives, needs of the Region, scientific basis, integration, water quality problems, and CEQA. The common theme throughout each project is managing salinity levels in the Region, utilizing recycled water, and improving water reliability. The proposal includes methods for determining quality and supply improvements. Applicant does not discuss how the projects will be monitored and evaluated after construction/implementation to verify objectives are met. The proposal did not include a plan for compliance with all applicable environmental review and permit requirements. It also did not provide the metrics that will be used to show measurable water quality and/or water supply improvements.

Question: Project Prioritization. Weighting factor is 2.

8

The Brineline Project is the first or highest priority since it is key to and integrates with the construction of the desalters, which are priorities 4, 5, and 6. The lowest priority projects involve creek restoration and invasive species removal. The project descriptions are detailed and are directly related to the IRWMP. The rationale for prioritization is well presented, but more detail is needed on how the sequencing of desalter projects is determined.

Question: Cost Estimate. Weighting factor is 1.

5

Cost estimates are submitted. If moved on to the next phase a better cost effectiveness analysis should be provided. Costs are broken down by 1) direct project admin costs; 2) land purchase/easement costs; 3) planning, design, engineering, environmental; 4) construction/implementation; 5) environmental compliance; and 6) various construction admin and contingency costs. The costs appear to be reasonable, the applicant is providing approximately 70% of the total funds, and contingency funds are generally 10% or less. Each project has its own cost breakdown, and a grand total is provided. Sources of funding match are indicated to be from USBR, CIP funds, and other federal and local grant programs.

Question: Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.

5

The applicant presents a complete Gant chart showing the sequence and timing of each of the 9 proposed projects. Some projects are separated into phases, and each phase is assigned a design and construction timeline. Planning and CEQA is accounted for in each project timeline.

Question: Need. Weighting factor is 2.

10

The applicant explains; 1) the need for the proposed projects; 2) current water management systems and long-term needs; 3) regional economic, environmental and fiscal impacts; and 4) critical impacts from lack of implementation. The applicant provides good rationale for implementation of these programs, and presents estimates of economic and resource implications associated with desalination.

Question: Disadvantaged Communities. Weighting factor is 2.

4

Benefits to DAC from implementation of this proposal are only marginally addressed. The applicant indicates that DAC make up 16.5% of the total communities but no area in the region is identified as DAC. Applicant states that DACs are disbursed throughout the region. While the proposed projects do not target DACs, they distribute the benefits broadly to the entire region. Further analysis and presentation of quantitative data on how this project will directly benefit DAC is needed for a higher score.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Program Preferences. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The proposal includes integrated projects that support and improve local and regional water supply reliability. More thorough documentation is needed indicating the projects will contribute expeditiously and measurably to the long term attainment and maintenance of water quality standards and eliminate or significantly reduce pollution in impaired waters and sensitive habitat areas. Diversion of stream flow may eliminate an important source of recharge through stream bed infiltration impacting water supply and quality in the long term. Also, the proposal does not show that it will positively impact the ASBS or support protected species such as steelhead or tidewater gobi.

TOTAL SCORE: 94